

## **Possible Criteria for SRFB Funding Decisions, Second Funding Increment**

### **Approaches to Allocating Funds Across Lead Entity Lists**

Page ten of *The Fifth Grant Round: Decisions Made by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board at its December 4-5, 2003 Meeting* lists three approaches to allocating the second increment (65%) of Fifth Round funding. Staff recommends that the ITF pursue Approach 3 (a combination of Approaches 1 and 2), with 55% of funds be allocated according to Approach 1 and the remaining 10% allocated according to Approach 2. Following is a list of potential criteria the SRFB could use in allocating these remaining funds. Where the criterion is derived from SRFB statutes or published SRFB policy, a citation is included.

### **Possible Criteria**

- Overall guidance: “The Board will use the technical panel review, lead entity experts and citizen committees, and SRFB technical staff to inform its funding decisions in each grant round. (SRFB policy manual Page 4)
- Overall guidance: “The Board shall utilize the statement of environmental benefits in it’s prioritization and selection process” (RCW 77.85.135)
- Fund whole projects or an entire project phase
- Consider project sponsor past performance (RCW 77.85.130(2)(b)(iii))
- Reward local match (RCW 77.85.130(2)(b)(ii))
- Efficiencies, cost savings (volunteers, donations, MOUs...)
  - Actions will be preferred that increase coordination, integrate efforts and leverage resources. (Board policy manual, p. 8)
  - Projects should be designed to address the project goals in the most cost-effective manner. This could include design features, materials, and use of donated materials and labor. (Board policy manual, p. 9)
- Consider total dollar amount being requested
- Consider public support
- Consider biological priorities
  - TRT priorities such as diversity, multiple core populations, benefits to multiple listed species
- Level of coordination with broader recovery planning
  - Actions will be preferred that increase coordination, integrate efforts and leverage resources. (Board policy manual, p. 8)

- Monitoring (RCW 77.85 sections .005 and .135)
  - Monitoring data could be used to demonstrate the effectiveness of a type of project (ex. ELJs)
  - The project includes volunteer collection of project monitoring data
  - The project is part of a Intensively Monitored Watershed strategy
- Fully representative citizens committee (RCW 77.85.050)
  - Perhaps relate “fully representative” to the list of entities listed in RCW 77.85.050
- Value less-than-fee acquisition (Board policy manual, p. 9)
- Value projects that help restore natural functions rather than only addressing symptoms resulting from disturbance of these functions. (Board policy manual, p. 9)
- Value projects without prior legal obligation. (see Board policy manual, p. 10)
- Consider loss of a critical opportunity (opportunity for acquisition, other funding sources, partnerships, ...)